

REMARKS

Claims 1,2, and 4-20 are pending. Claims 15-20 have been withdrawn by the Examiner. Applicants herein amend claims 5, 7, and 8 to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim, in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found in the specification and claims as filed. The specification has been amended at paragraphs [0007], [0021], and [0032] to correct a minor typographical error. The amendments add no new matter. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner stated that claims 5, 7, and 8 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have amended claims 5, 7, and 8 to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants submit that the amendments moot the Examiner's objection and place claims 5, 7, and 8 in condition for allowance.

Rejections Under 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, and 12-14 as allegedly anticipated by WO 92/020301 (Heywood). The Examiner asserted that Heywood discloses a catalyst gauze comprising weft threads, where the weft threads comprise noble metals, and wherein the gauze may be folded into layers so that the weft yarns are between the layers. The Examiner asserted that the gauze of Heywood may be formed on a circular knitting machine, that circular knitting "is a type of weft-knitting," and thus the Heywood gauze necessarily comprises weft threads.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. Applicants submit that Heywood does not disclose each and every element of the rejected claims. Heywood discloses gauzes having tricot stitching or raschel or jacquard knitting. Applicants submit that Heywood does not disclose a knitted catalyst gauze comprising weft threads, wherein the weft threads comprise noble metals. Applicants submit that Heywood does not disclose a catalyst gauze comprising a plurality of mesh layers, pile threads, wherein the pile threads join at least two mesh layers to each other, and weft threads comprising noble metal wires, wherein the weft threads are between at least two mesh layers that are joined by the pile threads. Applicants submit that the knitted gauzes disclosed in Heywood cannot comprise weft threads, because the preferred methods of making the Heywood gauzes do not employ circular machines:

Of the two types of knitting machine proposed for the purpose of knitting gauze, namely the rotary type and the warp type, *the warp machine is currently preferred.*

(Heywood, at page 8, lines 4-6, emphasis added). Although Heywood discloses that circular machines are not preferred, they may be used for catchment gauzes:

The limitations of circular or rotary knitting machines in terms of lack of width tend to be less acute in the field of catchment gauzes ... *The advantages of circular or rotary knitting machines, such as speed and flexibility,* can therefore be enjoyed under such circumstances without significant penalty.

(Heywood, at page 10, lines 20-29). Applicants submit that Heywood discloses circular or rotary machines for their *speed and flexibility* in making tricot stitching or raschel or jacquard knitting, *not* for making gauzes comprising weft threads. Applicants submit that the Heywood gauzes lack weft threads, since Heywood discloses that warp machines are preferred for making the gauzes:

Knitting machines using independently moving needles, or latched needles which move in unison can be used, and straight, circular, or warp knitting machines are suitable though *warp knitting machines are preferred*.

(Heywood at page 16, lines 29-32, emphasis added). Further, Heywood cannot render the rejected claims obvious, since Heywood lacks disclosure of weft threads in knitted gauzes and teaches away from using circular or rotary knitting machines and instead teaches the use of warp knitting machines. Thus, Heywood does not disclose each and every element of the rejected claims. Accordingly, the Heywood reference cannot anticipate the rejected claims, and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based on the Heywood reference.

Rejections Under 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 10 and 11 as allegedly obvious in light of Heywood. The Examiner asserted that Heywood discloses a catalyst gauze comprising weft threads, where the weft threads comprise noble metals, and where the gauze may be folded into layers so that the weft yarns are between the layers. The Examiner asserted it would have been obvious to select a desired layer thickness to optimize residence time of gases. The Examiner asserted it would have been obvious to select the number and angle of pile threads to result in a desired thickness.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. Heywood does not disclose, teach or suggest the present claims. Applicant refers the Examiner to the arguments made of record above with regard to the Heywood reference. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based on the Heywood reference.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments, and the remarks set forth above, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Applicant: NEUMANN *et al.*
Serial No.: 10/068,547
Filing Date: February 2, 2002
Response to Nonfinal Office Action
July 23, 2004
Page 10 of 10

Enclosed is the fee for a three-month extension of time. No additional fee is believed to be due with respect to the filing of this amendment. If any additional fees are due, or an overpayment has been made, please charge, or credit, our Deposit Account No. 11-0171 for such sum.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding the present application, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Smeland", written over a horizontal line.

For Smeland

Registration No.: 43,131
Attorney for Applicant

Kalow & Springut LLP
Telephone No.: (212) 813-1600